



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,795	12/31/2003	Michael S. Wengrovitz	134143	1799
77216	7590	03/09/2010	EXAMINER	
ALCATEL-LUCENT			ADDY, THJUAN KNOWLIN	
C/O GALASSO & ASSOCIATES, LP				
P. O. BOX 26503			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78755-0503			2614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/09/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 02/10/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant argues that Lindley involves a switch 206/circuit board 212 that is external to the computer 218, and that Lindley discloses a computer 218 connected to an external switch 206/circuit board 212 which Examiner equates to the PMIC of the present independent claim, whereas, as shown in Fig. 1 and described in the related discussion of Fig. 1 of the present application, the present invention involves computers enabled with a PMIC, hence the PMIC is internal to the computer.
3. In response to Applicant's arguments above, Examiner would like to bring to Applicant's attention that Denton was also used to disclose "the computer **including** a PBX Messaging Integration Client (PMIC) (for example, the flow connection module 204 and 209 may read on the recited PMIC), with the PMIC associated with an individual" (See Abstract, col. 4 lines 12-28, and col. 6-7 lines 54-17). Therefore, since Denton discloses a computer enabled with or including a "PMIC", Lindley does not necessarily need to further disclose the computer enabled with or including the "PMIC". Lindley may simply be used to disclose a "PMIC", which is capable of performing other functions, such as, placing and answering PBX calls without a PBX phone, routing incoming calls directed to PBX extensions to other devices, forwarding calls away from the PBX phones to other devices, and placing calls on hold (See col. 1 lines 50-55, col. 5 lines 31-52, col. 5 lines 58-63, and col. 7 lines 23-37). Therefore, in response to

Applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

4. Furthermore, in response to Applicant's arguments, the recitation "the computer including a PBX Messaging Integration Client (PMIC) capable of placing and answering PBX calls without a PBX phone, routing incoming calls directed to PBX extensions to other devices, forwarding calls away from the PBX phones to other devices, and placing calls on hold" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

/Thjuan K. Addy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614